

**REMARKS**

This response and amendment is submitted in response to the non-final Office Action dated December 2, 2004 (hereafter "office action"), having a shortened three-month statutory period set to expire April 2, 2005 with a one-month extension of time. The examiner had rejected pending claims 1 to 5, 7 to 13, 15, 17 to 20, 22 to 30, and 32 to 35 for various reasons stated in the office action. The examiner indicated that claims 6, 14, 16, 21, and 31 "would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims". Applicants appreciate the examiner's allowability of these claims.

**I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. Secs. 112**

The examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112. The examiner indicated that claim 20 recites the phrases "the first term" and "the second term", and the examiner indicated that there is insufficient antecedent basis for these terms in the claim. The examiner further states that he interprets claim 20 as being dependent on claim 19. Applicants have amended claim 20 to now depend from claim 19 instead of claim 18. Thus, claim 20, as amended, now overcomes the antecedent basis problem and overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. Secs. 102 and 103**

The examiner rejected claims 1 to 3, 15, 18, and 26 to 28 under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,725,192 to Araki et al. (hereafter "the Araki reference"). The examiner further rejected claims 4, 19, and 29 under 35 U.S.C.

Sec. 103(a) as being rendered obvious over the Araki reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,654,952 to Suzuki et al. (hereafter "the Suzuki reference"). The examiner also rejected claims 5, 20, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a) as being rendered obvious over the Araki reference in view of the Suzuki reference as applied to claims 4, 19, and 29 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,652 to Heddle (hereafter "the Heddle reference"). The examiner additionally rejected claims 7 to 9, 11, 17, 22 to 24, and 32 to 34 under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a) as being rendered obvious over the Araki reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,456,968 to Taniguchi et al. (hereafter "the Taniguchi reference"). Furthermore, the examiner rejected claims 11 to 12 under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a) as being rendered obvious over the Araki reference in view of the Taniguchi reference as applied to claim 11, further in view of the Suzuki reference and further in view of the Heddle reference. Also, the examiner rejected claims 10, 25, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a) as being rendered obvious over the Araki reference in view of the Taniguchi reference as applied to claims 9, 24, and 34 and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,041,295 to Hinderks. The examiner indicated various reasons for these rejections in the office action.

However, applicants have decided to amend all of the broad pending independent claims 1, 11, 15, 18, and 26 to respectively recite all of the limitations of corresponding allowable dependent claims 6, 14, 16, 21, and 31. Thus, claims 1, 11, 15, 18, and 26, as amended, are in effect the allowable claims 6, 14, 16, 21, and 31 re-written in independent form. Applicants have cancelled claims 6, 14, 16, 21, and 31

without prejudice, and claims 1, 11, 15, 18, and 26, as amended, are now clearly allowable.

The specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed fully support the respective amendments to the claims. Therefore, the application with pending claims 1 to 5, 7 to 13, 15, 17 to 20, 22 to 30, and 32 to 35, as respectively amended, is now in condition for allowance, and allowance is earnestly solicited. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

A one-month extension of time is required for filing this Response and Amendment. Please consider this paragraph such a Request for a term extension. No other fees are believed to be due; however, if any fees are due by the filing of the enclosed documents, including any fees incurred by an extension of term, please consider this paragraph such a Request for additional term and an authorization to charge such additional fees. The examiner is authorized to charge any fees associated with the Request or any other fees incurred by the filing of this document to Cirrus Logic Deposit Account No. 03-2028/1174-CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Apr. 11, 2005

By: SL  
Steven Lin  
Registration No. 35,250

CIRRUS LOGIC, INC.  
Legal Department  
2901 Via Fortuna  
Austin, Texas 78746  
Telephone: (512)851-4465  
Fax: (512) 851-4500